

an officer in the Chinese army and an executive in the Chinese company which (among its many business enterprises) launches satellites, gave him money with instructions to donate a portion of those funds to the Democratic Party.

If substantiated, these assertions could have serious implications. That said, it also should be noted that, provided the safeguards described above do their job, even if a quid pro quo were sought and given, a satellite waiver might work to the commercial advantage of Liu's company, but would not have contributed to China's military capabilities.

In sum, several of the issues being raised in the current controversy are real and serious. Others, particularly those related to charges that satellite launch waivers somehow enhanced Chinese missile capabilities, may be based on fundamentally mistaken premises. Key to making that determination is an assessment of the practical effectiveness of the safeguards policies and practices that apply to these satellite launches.

If careful analysis determines that these safeguards have substantially achieved their objectives, then the imposition of blanket prohibitions on satellite launches by China would largely miss the point. On the one hand, it would not deal with concerns about how campaign contributions—from Americans, to say nothing of Chinese—might influence government decisions in ways which produce commercial advantage. On the other hand, it could prove to be worse than redundant with the safeguards already in place, because it would both place American industry at a competitive disadvantage and do needless damage to our critically important relationship with China.

One fact, however, already is abundantly clear: A great deal is at stake in the answers to the questions being raised in the current controversy. It therefore is essential that we get it right—that all of the charges be thoroughly investigated, that penalties be levied where appropriate, and that remedial actions be taken where required. But we should let the congressional committees do their jobs before a rush to judgment that may harm rather than advance our interests.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 9, 1998

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the attached editorial from The Washington Times illustrates why we should help parents send their children to schools of their choice. Mayor Stephen Goldsmith of Indianapolis uses the situation in that city to demonstrate why Catholic schools have been able to perform better than the public schools. I submit the editorial to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

HOW TO BUILD A BETTER SCHOOL SYSTEM (By Stephen Goldsmith)

President Clinton found ardent supporters of his proposal to invest in public school buildings at a recent meeting with members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. More money for schools—without having to raise local taxes—is a no-brainer for many mayors seeking an answer to failing urban schools.

Yet there are a handful of mayors from both parties who believe that more than federal dollars are needed to address the real problems facing urban schools. As cities have

experienced the downward spiral of rising taxes, declining enrollment and abysmal students performance, increasingly city leaders are recognizing that lack of money is not what ails our public school systems.

The Indianapolis Public School system is the largest of eleven in this city, responsible for approximately 43,000 students from the central part of the city. During the 1990s the district raised its taxes more than a third, even as enrollment dropped by 10 percent. Not including teacher pensions, IPS spends more than \$9,000 per child—as much if not more than the city's most expensive private schools. If money were the key ingredient for quality schools, students at IPS would rank among the best in the world. Instead, student test scores are among the worst in Indiana—a state that consistently ranks in the bottom 10 percent in the nation.

As the district's declining enrollment makes clear, dissatisfied parents are seeking out alternatives to public schools. While middle and upper class families often either move to the suburbs or pay private school tuition, many less affluent parents have turned to a less expensive choice: Catholic schools.

Like IPS, inner city parochial schools in Indianapolis are racially diverse and serve primarily low income, non-Catholic kids. At St. Philip Neri, a Catholic school on the city's near east side, nearly three quarters of all students qualify for the federal school lunch program, and a similar proportion are not Catholic.

Unlike IPS, tuition at these schools averages a mere \$2700 per child. Yet each year parochial students demonstrate a better grasp of learning fundamentals than students in the public school system. Perhaps even more telling, student performance improves for each year spend in Catholic schools, while scores at IPS decline. In a recent evaluation of standardized test scores, Catholic school third graders held relatively small advantages over IPS students in math and English. By the eighth grade, however, Catholic school students scored nearly twice as high as students in the public system.

There are two important reasons why Catholic schools outperform their public counterparts.

First, they are allowed to succeed. Catholic schools are free from the bloated education bureaucracies that divert tax dollars away from public classrooms. The Friedman Foundation estimates that as little as 30 cents out of every dollar spent on education in Indianapolis actually make their way to the places where children learn. The rest is lost on the layers of bureaucracy between Indiana's Department of Education and teachers. For example, over the next three years the IPS Service Center, which houses support services such as vehicle maintenance, media services, and a print shop, will undertake a nearly \$7.5 million capital improvement project. The task: constructing a new kitchen.

In addition to siphoning off dollars, the school bureaucracy undermines public education by dictating in great detail how principals can run their schools and teachers can teach their students. The morass of regulations governing public education prevents teachers from tailoring their teaching to the diverse needs of students and taking innovative approaches to educating. Not coincidentally, some of the best IPS schools are those at which teachers routinely disregard many of these rules, using their own choice of textbooks, curricula, and teaching methods to ensure that kids learn.

The other reason that Catholic schools succeed is equally simple: they have to. If St. Philip Neri fails to satisfy its customers, parents will take their tuition dollars else-

where. In contrast, customer satisfaction is irrelevant to public schools, especially those serving low income families. Government simply tells these parents which school their children must attend, and parents who cannot afford a private alternative have no choice but to send their children there, regardless of how poorly that school performs.

If we are committed to giving all our children an opportunity, we must apply to the public school system the same simple principles that enable private and parochial schools to succeed.

In Indianapolis, our experience with allowing public employees and private companies to compete for contracts to provide city services has consistently demonstrated that competition improves government-run enterprises. For each of the 75 services subjected to competition, marketplace pressure has exploded bureaucracies, reducing layers of management, empowering workers, and refocusing these agencies on satisfying their customers. In order to win business, public employees have cut their own budgets while improving service quality, dramatically outperforming their previous, better-funded monopoly.

The same competitive forces can empower public schools to succeed. Committed reformers have offered numerous proposals to break up the government school monopoly and empower public schools to educate more effectively, including vouchers, charter schools, and the education savings accounts currently before Congress. Unfortunately, the president's threatened veto of the education savings proposal demonstrates that this administration continues to believe that any problem can be cured with more federal dollars.

Forcing lower income parents to send their children to poorly performing schools (even in nice buildings) will not improve the prospects of urban youths. What our cities' mayors should be advocating for in Washington is not simply more money to support a failing school bureaucracy, but more help for parents to send their children to the schools of their choice.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2400, BUILDING EFFICIENT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND EQUITY ACT OF 1998

SPEECH OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, May 22 1998

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science whose jurisdictional area of expertise includes transportation research and development once again is pleased to have worked closely with the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in efforts to strengthen the research program of the Department of Transportation by first developing a comprehensive research title for the House version of this legislation and later by serving as conferees on the research title.

I would like to thank Chairmen SHUSTER and PETRI as well as Ranking Democratic Members OBERSTAR and RAHALL for their cooperation in bringing a research title to the floor which incorporated most of the significant provisions reported by the Committee on Science and for working with us to ensure that the House comprehensive research program prevailed in conference to the extent possible. I